



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,700	11/08/2001	Shinobu Sato	15069	7039

23389 7590 05/11/2006

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

DANG, DUY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,700

Applicant(s)

SATO, SHINOBU

Examiner

Duy M. Dang

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Section I (Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 Under U.S.C 103(a)) 2nd paragraph ("*The Tanaka patent was issued after...103(c)(I)*), filed on April 17, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. As pointed out by Applicant, the U.S. Patent No. 6,798,893 to Tanaka was issued after the U.S. filing date of the present application and both the patent to Tanaka and the present application are commonly assigned to NEC Corporation. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as below.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2624

3. Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,893 (referred as the patent '893 hereinafter). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each of the limitations of the instant claims is fully defined by the patented claims of the patent '893. Specifically, each of the limitations of the instant claim 1 is set forth in claim patented claim 1 for example. While the patented claim 1 includes additional limitations not set forth in claim 1 of the instant application, the use of transitional term "comprising" in the instant claim 1 fails to preclude the possibility of additional elements. Therefore, claim 1 of the instant application fails to define an invention that is patentably distinct from patented claim 1 for example. Likewise, the same analysis is applicable to instant claims 4-7 and 10-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in Sec. 101.

... a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.

... signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 14 defines “a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave” with descriptive material. While functional descriptive material may be claimed as a statutory product (i.e., a “manufacture”) when embodied on a tangible computer readable medium, a “signal” per se does not fall within any of the four statutory classes of 35 U.S.C. §101. A “signal” is not a process because it is not a series of steps per se. Furthermore, a “signal” is not a “machine”, “composition of matter” or a “manufacture” because these statutory classes “relate to structural entities and can be grouped as ‘product’ claims in order to contrast them with process claims.” (1 D. Chisum, Patents § 1.02 (1994)). Machines, manufactures and compositions of matter are embodied by physical structures or material, whereas a “signal” has neither a physical structure nor a tangible material. That is, a “signal” is not a “machine” because it has no physical structure, and does not perform any useful, concrete and tangible result. Likewise, a “signal” is not a “composition of matter” because it is not “matter”, but rather a form of energy. Finally, a “signal” is not a “manufacture” because all traditional definitions of a “manufacture” have required some form of physical structure, which a claimed signal does not have.

A “manufacture” is defined as “the production of articles for use from raw materials or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties, or combinations, whether by hand-labor or by machinery.” *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 308, 206 USPQ 193, 196-97 (1980) (quoting *American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brogdex Co.*, 283 U.S. 1, 11, 8 USPQ 131, 133 (1931)).

Therefore, a “signal” is considered non-statutory because it is a form of energy, in the absence of any physical structure or tangible material, that does not fall within any of the four statutory classes of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Florencio et al. (USPN 6,208,745 B1. Referred as Florencio hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15, Florencio teaches a data insertion (*i.e., watermark processor 104 of figures 1-2*) device comprising: an input device which inputs compressed image data including a plurality of types of pictures (*i.e., encoder 102 of figure 1 and its description portion mentioned in col. 3 lines 16-35: note I, P, B frames*); a determining device which determines the type of the picture for each picture (*i.e., the identifying macroblock mentioned in col. 3 line 64 to col. 4 line 20; the identifying of blocks within a “busy” mentioned in col. 4 lines 3-44. Also refer to col. 4 lines 57-67 which describes to insert invisible watermark to B frame and invisible watermark to I/P frames: This inherently provides a determination of types of picture of each I/P/B frames in order for the watermark to be inserted into I/P/B frame properly*); an inserting device (*i.e., watermark processor 104 of figures 1-2*) which inserts pattern data into each picture (*i.e., insertion of invisible or visible watermark into each picture I/P/B*

Art Unit: 2624

according to col. 4 lines 57-67) with an insertion intensity according to the type determined about the corresponding picture (i.e., "strength" mentioned in col. 7 lines 48-50), the pattern data being modified by the inserting device to have the insertion intensity (i.e., watermark encoder 210 of figure 2 and its description mentioned in col. 5 line 47 to col. 6 line 10: note that the watermark generated by watermark generator 208 is DCT processed and quantized by watermark encoder 210 to produce encoded watermark which corresponds to the so called "pattern data being modified"; and also refer to "strength" mentioned in col. 7 lines 48-55).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With regard to claims 3 and 9, the closest prior art (Florencio) fails to teach wherein the modification is done by multiplying the pattern data by a multiplier rate which is adjust according to determined type.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Morimoto et al. (USPN 6,005,643) is an example of watermark insertion.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duy M. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-7389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:00AM to 2:30PM.

Art Unit: 2624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew C. Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dmd
05/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Duy M. Dang', with a stylized, flowing script.

Duy M. Dang
Patent Examiner